(97)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. No. 1590 of 2006

Petitioner		M/s. Yasini Construction Company, A-IV Class Contractor, Rani Road, Ali Manzil, Korba (C.G.) Represented through its partner Syed Furgat Ali Yasini, S/o. Haji Syed Masru Hussain, R/o. Behind Middle School, Yasini Manzil Chowk, Mohalla Ward No.1, House No. 285, Ramsagar Para, Korba (C.G.)
	Versus	
Respondents	1.	State of Chhattisgarh Through its Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, D. K. S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
	2.	Officer on Special Duty, Water Resources Department, Raipur (C.G.)
	3.	Engineer-in-Chief, Water Resources Department, Raipur (C.G.)
	4.	Chief Engineer, Hasdeo Bango Project, Bilaspur (C.G.)
	5.	Superintending Engineer, Hasdeo Project Circle, Rampur, Korba (C.G.)
	6.	Executive Engineer, Minimata Bango Canal Division No.3, Sakti, District Janjgir – Champa (C.G.)
	7.	Sub-Divl. Officer, Hasdeo Canal Sub-Division Jaijaipur, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

SB: Hon'ble Shri **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

Smt. Fouzia Mirza, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Sumesh Bajaj, Govt. Advocate for the respondents.

ORAL ORDER

(Passed on this 21st day of November, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner seeks compliance of the letter dated 8.4.2002 (Annexure P/1) issued by the Chief Engineer, Mini Mata (Hasdev) Bango

98

Project, Bilaspur, addressed to the Superintending Engineer, Hasdev Project Division, Rampur/Korba.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents/State submits that pursuant to the letter dated 8.4.2002 (Annexure P/1) the final measurement has been duly taken and the same has been accepted by the petitioner on 24.7.2002 (Annexure 'A' filed with the affidavit dated 20.11.2007).

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents/State further submits that subsequent decision has been taken after having taken the final decision. Therefore, it is expected that after taking final measurement, pursuant to the order dated 8.4.2002, the State would take consequential steps, if not already done.

4. In view of the above, nothing survives in this matter. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of. No order asto costs.

Sd/-
Satish K.Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur